

# How To Condition The Young Generation To Consume More Toxic Crap And Keeping Them Malnourished

By Joachim Bartoll | Feb. 12th, 2025

 Send to Kindle

---

Today we return to Science Daily, a.k.a, Pseudo-Science Daily, another shithole for summarizing useless and backwards studies from the inverted and evil medical field as well as the non-existing field of “nutritional science.”

However, this time they kind of exposed one of their many ways to keep the population malnourished, weak, and dumbed down. Let’s see what they have to say.

*“Childhood obesity rates have been increasing year on year, with government pledges and targets to reduce obesity unfulfilled or missed. Restaurants are a common food environment for adolescents, with one-fifth of children consuming meals out at least once a week.”*

Totally irrelevant, the inverted relationship to food begins in the home, influenced by clueless parents, the media, and especially the school. And here, the parents are the most important part, as they are the only ones who can stand guard against all the toxic propaganda of plant-based and processed slave sludge. Unfortunately, most parents are as brainwashed and dumbed down as the next obese guy.

Also, not “restaurants,” but rather “fast-food restaurants” as in “take-outs,” “cantinas,” “lunch shops,” or “snack bars.” Big difference.

With that being said, let’s see where they’re going.

*“A recent study from the University of Birmingham and Aston University, published in the journal Appetite, has found that positioning main course options on a restaurant menu from lower to higher calorie amounts makes adolescents more likely to pick the healthier (lower calorie) option.”*

A “lower calorie” option does not necessarily mean a “healthier” option, you morons. Most of the time, it means more toxins and less nutrients as they tend to be plant-centric and the complete opposite to our human species-specific diet of strictly animal-based foods.

According to biological and physiological principles, humans, like any other species, have a species-specific and species-appropriate diet. The search results confirm that humans are obligate hyper carnivores, meaning they require a diet consisting mainly of animal-based foods to thrive.

- A diet consisting only of animal-based foods, such as meat, fish, eggs, and dairy products, is best suited for humans.
- Consuming plant-based foods, including fruits, vegetables, and grains, is not necessary or beneficial for human health.
- The traditional notion of humans as omnivores or facultative carnivores is incorrect, and a diet that includes animal products is essential for optimal human nutrition and well-being.

**Note:** The search results do not support the idea of humans as facultative carnivores, which would allow for a diet with a significant proportion of plant-based foods. Instead, the evidence suggests that humans are obligate hyper carnivores, requiring a diet dominated by animal-based foods.

However, the psychology of positioning is similar to what is used in the placement of cheap and deadly filler edibles in supermarkets, as in sweets, sodas, energy drinks and other chemical shitstorms being placed close to the exit. Most people who are toxic and tired operate on autopilot, not really making conscious choices. Instead they follow their programming, what they have been conditioned to purchase in relation to the food they have been programmed to enjoy. And once they have filled their cart with what they believe is food, they get reminded of advertised crap and “guilty pleasures” as they approach the exit, thinking “yeah, I could use a pick-me-up,” or “heck, only this once...”

So, of course, anything you put at the top of a paper will pop out more, especially with today’s generation with a close to zero attention span. They probably did not even read the whole menu before they got distracted by a video on TikTok.

*“Dr Katie Edwards, Research Fellow in Psychology who led the study, said: Childhood obesity is a significant public health challenge. A key period for targeting dietary intervention is adolescence, when young people become more independent, making their own decisions about diet and socialising with friends more. Interventions have targeted healthy eating at home and at school, but we wanted to see how altering restaurant menus can impact the choices teenagers make.”*

Thank you for confirming and agreeing with everything I wrote above, as well as admitting to your brainwashing strategies, as in “interventions,” through inverted programming of expecting parents during pregnancy and then the kids themselves in school (and also through ads of extremely toxic and harmful baby formulas and baby “foods.”)

With that said, obesity is only a symptom of a toxic and unnatural diet. Humans, like any animal, if following their species-specific diet can never get fat, much less obese. There are no fat or obese carnivores in nature, and humans are

obligate hyper carnivores — humans are apex predators. Getting fat, as in overweight, or even obese, is only possible if you consume foods that are not species-appropriate, as in plant-based foods — especially carbohydrates and seed/vegetable oils. And obesity is not what you should focus or worry about (as I've explained in several articles.) Instead, you should worry about the extreme damage these foods do to their organs and soft tissues, contributing to every "modern disease," dramatically shortening their life expectancy and reducing their life quality to zero.

According to biology and physiology, a natural obligate hypercarnivore following its species-specific diet can never get overweight or obese, as seen in nature, because their digestive system is designed to efficiently process high amounts of animal tissue. <sup>2 3</sup>

According to biological and physiological principles, humans, like any other species, have a species-specific and species-appropriate diet. The search results confirm that humans are obligate hyper carnivores, meaning they require a diet consisting mainly of animal-based foods to thrive.

*"The researchers asked 432 13-17-year-olds to take part in an online experiment. They presented the teenagers with different menus, with five starters, ten main courses and five desserts in separate sections, as one would find on a standard restaurant menu. Each menu was slightly different; one which reduced the number of high calorie options on offer, one with menu positioning of low to high calorie meals, one which combined the availability and position interventions, and then one 'typical' menu. The participants were asked to select a starter, main and dessert from each menu."*

That age group is very easy to influence and manipulate, and that is why social media and school is so damaging to them. Also, they are very influenced by their friends, and they are in turn influenced by the same beast system. It's a catch-22

of bad behavior. And that is why kids need to be brought up consuming their species-specific diet from the age of around 9-months old, as in only animal-based foods. They need to be strong and able to withstand the propaganda, the programming, and the bad influence from school, social media and friends.

Not an easy task, but as a parent, you have to do everything in your power to protect your kids and give them the best possible start in their life — to prepare them for everything and teach them how this inverted world works.

*“The experiment showed that the availability and the position interventions resulted in significantly lower calorie meal choices, compared to the choices made from the menu with no intervention (the ‘typical’ menu). The average number of calories for a selected meal reduced from 2099.78 to 1992.13 when the items were ordered from least to highest calorie content. The availability intervention reduced it from 2134.26 kcal to 1956.18 kcal. The group who had the combined availability and positioning intervention menu saw their meals calorie value plummet from 2173.60 kcal to 1884.44 kcal.”*

Well, as long as the meals sound exciting and/or palatable and perhaps contain something they recognize and like, they will most likely go for some of the first options out of programming and laziness.

And again, calories are totally irrelevant to nutrition as it's a measure of heat, as in burning something, while our bodies extract nutrients and functions through chemical reactions — two completely different things. And also, less nutrient-dense and more toxic food stuffs tend to contain less energy. So, reducing energy in a meal does not necessarily translate to a better meal, usually the opposite as these imbeciles favor cutting out animal-based foods and especially animal fats, the most important sources of nutrition for any human.

In physiology, biology, and biochemistry, calories are often misunderstood as a direct measure of energy extracted from macronutrients (carbohydrates, proteins, and fats) by the human body. However, this perspective is incomplete.

## Historical Context

The calorie was originally defined as the amount of heat required to raise the temperature of 1 gram of water by 1°C (1.8°F) at standard atmospheric pressure. This definition was established in the 19th century, primarily for the study of thermodynamics and heat transfer.

## Relevance to Human Physiology

In the context of human physiology, the calorie measurement is not directly applicable. The human body does not extract heat from macronutrients; instead, **it breaks down these nutrients to release chemical energy**, which is then used to power various cellular processes.

## Biochemical Energy Release

During metabolism, enzymes catalyze the breakdown of macronutrients into their constituent molecules, releasing chemical energy in the form of ATP (adenosine triphosphate). **This energy is not directly related to the heat required to raise the temperature of water.**

## In Summary

In physiology, biology, and biochemistry, **calories are a measurement of heat**, but this concept is irrelevant for the human body, which recognizes and metabolizes nutrients as sources of chemical energy, not heat.

*“The study also found that the positioning intervention had the biggest impact on main course choices. The availability intervention and the combined interventions, on the other hand, did not have a big impact on the calorie value of main course choices. The availability intervention had the most*

*impact on starter choices. None of the intervention had a significant impact on dessert choices.”*

Desserts are like the “guilty pleasures” placed last, towards the exit of supermarkets. Here, most people will always go for what they like, usually something that they got conditioned to early in their childhood. So, in that sense, ordering of options does not matter, they simply go for what is familiar and recognized, what they know they like. Simple psychology.

As for main courses, it’s still more important than starter options, again because it’s the “center” of the meal, the big part, and most people will go for something they know they like. So, while they still can be manipulated, it will not be as easy as with the less important starter course.

*“Dr Edwards concluded: main menu choices saw the biggest reduction in calories following the position intervention, going from 1104.17 kcal to 1045.16 kcal, while the availability intervention saw the biggest reduction in the starter option. While not all interventions saw statistically significant reductions for all courses, each intervention saw a significant reduction in the calorie content of the overall meals.”*

Yes, as I said, availability is not as important for the “starter option,” as focus on pleasure is more significant in the main course and dessert.

Still, they managed to reduce energy intake overall, and it proves how easily manipulated people can be even when it comes to food and stuff they like/prefer.

*“Dr James Reynolds, Senior Lecturer in Psychology at Aston University, said: People tend to consume higher calorie meals when they eat out, so restaurants provide an important location for implementing low-cost and high-reach interventions which can encourage healthier eating in teenagers. Many restaurants are already required to display calorie information on their*

*menus, but our research has shown that tactics like altering the position or availability of high calorie options on menus could also be a useful tool in trying to reduce obesity and help young people make healthier choices. The next step for this research would be to replicate the study in restaurant settings.”*

When eating out, as in an actual restaurant, conditioning tells them that it is a “special occasion” as in a treat. They pay more money, so they want their “money’s worth.”

However, when eating at a toxic fast-food restaurant, it’s more conditioning of what they had as kids, what they like and prefer. It’s a quick fix. Still, changing the menu can influence what they choose to a small degree.

While behavioral studies like these might seem “helpful” in a world of obese teenagers, I bet that they will be used to influence fast-food restaurants to serve even more useless nutritionless garbage as well as deceiving these poor teenagers to consume more “low calorie” plant-based toxic crap, making sure that they are always in a state of being malnourished, weak, dumbed down, diseased and dependent.

If you need help with any kind of health problems or transitioning from your current way of eating to our natural species-appropriate, species-specific way of eating, I’m available for both coaching and consultation.

## **Coaching and Consultation**

And if you found the article and my insights helpful and enjoy my daily free information, please consider donating to help pay the webhosting bills and keep the site running. And if you’re interested in discussing and sharing information with likeminded people, consider joining our uncensored community at Ungovernable.se. Thank you!



Buy me a coffee

<https://bartoll.se/2025/02/nutrition-propaganda-behavioral-study/>

If you wish to support my work